

Appl. No. 10/678,549
Amdt. dated October 8, 2004
Reply to Office action of July 26, 2004,

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action mailed July 26, 2004.

The Examiner rejected claims 16-23 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting, stating that each of claims 16-23 is obvious in light of independent claim 1 of applicant's prior U.S. Patent No. 5,345,170. Enclosed is a terminal disclaimer that overcomes the Examiner's rejection.

The Examiner indicated that some of the references cited in applicant's prior PTO-1449 submission were not considered because copies of those references were not found in the file of prior U.S. Application No. 10/274,068. An additional PTO-1449 form has been submitted listing each of these non-considered references, with copies of each reference also submitted.

In view of the foregoing remarks and the enclosed terminal disclaimer, the applicant respectfully requests consideration and allowance of claims 16-23.

Respectfully submitted,



Kurt Rohlf
Reg. No. 54,405
Tel No.: (503) 227-5631